

**REMARKS**

This response addresses the issues raised by the Examiner in the Office Action mailed January 11, 2007. Initially, Applicant would like to thank the Examiner for the careful consideration given in this case.

Applicants have canceled Claims 1, 3-7 and added new Claims 8-19 for the sole purpose of advancing prosecution. Accordingly, new Claims 8-19 are pending in this case. In view of the remarks presented herein, it is respectfully submitted that the present application is in condition for final allowance and notice to such effect is requested.

In independent Claim 8, Applicant claims an assembly for securing an inertial unit to a rack comprising the rack having a plurality of pegs and the inertial unit having a plurality of sleeves, where the pegs and the rack form one integral peg/rack piece. In the assembly, the amount pegs and sleeves are equal and the peg comprises an anterior portion to be introduced with clearance into the sleeve and a posterior fixing part that is designed to compensate for the clearance, where the pegs and sleeves are aligned when the inertial unit is push-fitted onto the peg/rack piece. Support for this claim may be found, for example, at paragraph [0018].

In independent Claim 14, Applicant claims an assembly for securing an inertial unit to a rack comprising the inertial unit having a plurality of pegs and the rack having a plurality of sleeves, where the pegs and the inertial unit form one integral peg/inertial unit piece. In the assembly, the amount pegs and sleeves are equal and the peg comprises an anterior portion to be introduced with clearance into the sleeve and a posterior fixing part that is designed to compensate for the clearance, where the pegs and sleeves are aligned when the peg/inertial unit piece is push-fitted onto the rack. Support for this claim may be found, for example, at paragraph [0029]. No new matter has been added by these new claims.

It is respectfully submitted that the amendment presented does in fact more specifically define the invention, and place the application in condition for allowance. Entry of the amendment, and reconsideration of the application as amended, is respectfully requested.

**I. Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103**

The Examiner has rejected Claims 1 and 3-6 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,612,687 to Cescon et al. ("Cescon") in view of U.S. Patent No. 4,630,983 to Fischer ("Fischer") and U.S. Patent No. 5,850,676 to Takahashi et al. ("Takahashi") as applied to new independent Claims 8 and 14. Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection for the following reasons.

The Examiner acknowledged that Cescon is silent as to how the inertial rack unit is fixed to the rack and that Cescon does not disclose a plurality of assemblies. The Examiner then refers to Fischer to cure this deficiency. The Examiner argues that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention to modify Cescon, such that the inertial is fixed to the rack by peg and slot assembly of Fischer, to maintain a snug fit between the peg and slot and in turn, maintain the connection. Also, the Examiner has conceded that Fischer discloses only one assembly of a peg and sleeve, not a plurality as claimed. The Examiner then refers to Takahashi to cure this deficiency. Accordingly, the Examiner concludes that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention to modify Cescon, such that a plurality of pegs and sleeves, as taught by Takahashi are used to fasten to the rack to the inertial unit. Applicant respectfully disagrees.

In order to establish obviousness of a claimed invention, all elements of the claims must be disclosed, taught or suggested by the prior art. None of the references teach that the assembly for securing a an inertial unit to a rack where the pegs and the rack form one integral peg/rack piece or the pegs and the inertial unit form one integral peg/inertial unit piece in the case where the amount pegs and sleeves are equal. The pegs and sleeves are aligned when the inertial unit is push-fitted onto the peg/rack piece or the pegs and sleeves are aligned when the peg/inertial unit piece is push-fitted onto the rack. In other words, none of the references teach the pluralities of assemblies, where the pegs and the sleeves are an integral part of the rack and inertial unit and vice versa. See Paragraphs [0002], [0003] and [0029].

Applicant agrees with the Examiner that Cescon is silent as to how the inertial rack unit is fixed to the rack and that Cescon does not disclose a plurality of assemblies. Cescon discloses an aircraft comprising an inertial unit fixed on a rack See Abstract. However, Cescon does not disclose the problem raised by the fixation of an inertial unit to a rack with a

plurality of assemblies of a peg and of a sleeve where the pegs and the sleeves are an integral part of the rack and inertial unit let alone a solution to fix the problem raised in the present invention. Cescon also does not teach modifying the expansion pin for a piece of masonry in order to have it function on an inertial unit of an aircraft.

In regards to Fischer, Applicant agrees with the Examiner that Fischer does not disclose plurality of assemblies of a peg and of a sleeve of an inertial unit and a rack. Fischer discloses an expansion pin that is a particular type of nail, which is driven into a hole. This nail is drilled through the article and the piece of masonry by means of a strong hammer. See Col 3, lines 44-6767. This expansion pin is capable of further expansion should the drill hole become wider. See Col. 1, lines 29-32. The expansion pin in Fischer has a shank which can be expanded by means of an expansion element that engages in an aperture region. See Col. 1, lines 5-10. This nail is a separate from the piece of masonry and article to be fixed to the piece of masonry. Fischer does not disclose an assembly for securing an inertial unit to a rack where the pegs and the rack form one integral peg/rack piece or the pegs and the inertial unit form one integral peg/inertial unit piece in the case where the amount pegs and sleeves are equal and the pegs and sleeves are aligned when the inertial unit is push-fitted onto the peg/rack piece or the pegs and sleeves are aligned when the peg/inertial unit piece is push-fitted onto the rack. In other words, Fischer does not teach the pluralities of assemblies, where the pegs and the sleeves are an integral part of the rack and inertial unit and vice versa. Further, Fischer discloses clamping an article to a piece of masonry whereas Applicant's invention discloses fixing an inertial unit of an aircraft to a rack of an aircraft.

In regards to Takahashi, Takahashi discloses a clip with engaging mechanism. See Col. 1, lines 9-19. The clip in Takahashi comprises a male member and a female member, the latter comprising elastic pieces, to connect two or more panels, the clips being arranged so that the elastic pieces are prevented from being deviated when deviating force is applied. However, Takahashi does not disclose an assembly for securing an inertial unit to a rack where the pegs and the rack form one integral peg/rack piece or the pegs and the inertial unit form one integral peg/inertial unit piece in the case where the amount pegs and sleeves are equal. The pegs and sleeves are aligned when the inertial unit is push-fitted onto the peg/rack piece or the pegs and sleeves are aligned when the peg/inertial unit piece is push-fitted onto the rack. Accordingly, Takahashi does not teach the pluralities of assemblies, where the pegs

and the sleeves are an integral part of the rack and inertial unit and vice versa. Takahashi is unlike present invention because Takahashi discloses both members are independent from the two pieces to be fixed.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submit that the claimed assemblies of a peg and of a sleeve of an inertial unit and a rack of an aircraft is not obvious over the teaching of Cescon in view of Fischer and Takahashi. Further, the problem of simultaneous push-fitting of a plurality of assemblies of a peg and of a sleeve is not disclosed in Cescon, Fischer or Takahashi. In addition, one skilled in the art would find nothing in Cescon, Fischer or Takahashi alone or in combination that would disclose, teach or suggest the claimed composition or any reason for making it. This is because there is no motivation taught in any of the references to combine the references in such a way to provide the assemblies, where the pegs and the sleeves are an integral part of the rack and inertial unit and vice versa as claimed. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a) be reconsidered and withdrawn.

The Examiner has rejected Claim 7 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,612,687 to Cescon et al. ("Cescon") in view of U.S. Patent No. 4,630,983 to Fischer ("Fischer") and U.S. Patent No. 5,850,676 to Takahashi et al. ("Takahashi") as applied to Claim 6 above, further in view of U.S. Patent No. 3,962,775 to King, Jr. ("King") as applied to new Claims 13 and 19. This rejection is respectfully traversed and believed overcome in view of the following discussion.

The Examiner argues that King teaches the use of graphite on an expansion, in a sleeve, such as graphite, as a lubricant. Accordingly, the Examiner concludes that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention to modify Cescon, Fischer and Takahashi, such that a graphite deposit is included on the peg of Fischer, to lubricate the peg, thereby allowing easier insertion into the sleeve. Applicant respectfully disagrees.

In order to establish obviousness of a claimed invention, all elements of the claims must be disclosed, taught or suggested by the prior art. As stated above, none of the references teach that the assembly for securing a an inertial unit to a rack where the pegs and the rack form one integral peg/rack piece or the pegs and the inertial unit form one integral peg/inertial unit piece in the case where the amount pegs and sleeves are equal. The pegs and

sleeves are aligned when the inertial unit is push-fitted onto the peg/rack piece or the pegs and sleeves are aligned when the peg/inertial unit piece is push-fitted onto the rack. In other words, none of the references teach the pluralities of assemblies, where the pegs and the sleeves are an integral part of the rack and inertial unit and vice versa.

Applicant agrees with the Examiner that Cescon, Fischer and Takahashi do not disclose the peg to be coated with a graphite deposit. As stated above, Cescon, Fischer and Takahashi do not disclose a plurality of assemblies of a peg and of a sleeve of an inertial unit of an aircraft and a rack of an aircraft which are intended to be push-fitted simultaneously one into the other to fix the inertial unit to the rack where the pegs and the sleeves are an integral part of the rack and inertial unit and vice versa.

In regards to King, King discloses a fastener guide assembly. See Abstract. However, King does not disclose do not disclose a plurality of assemblies of a peg and of a sleeve of an inertial unit of an aircraft and a rack of an aircraft which are intended to be push-fitted simultaneously one into the other to fix the inertial unit to the rack where the pegs and the sleeves are an integral part of the rack and inertial unit and vice versa.

Applicant respectfully submit that the claimed assemblies of a peg and of a sleeve of an inertial unit of an aircraft and a rack of an aircraft is not obvious over the teaching of Cescon in view of either Fischer, Takahashi or King. In addition, one skilled in the art would find nothing in Cescon, Fischer, Takahashi or King alone or in combination that would disclose, teach or suggest the claimed composition or any reason for making it. This is because there is no motivation taught in any of the references to combine the references in such a way to provide the assemblies, where the pegs and the sleeves are an integral part of the rack and inertial unit and vice versa as claimed. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a) be reconsidered and withdrawn.

**II. Conclusion**

In view of the remarks presented herein, it is respectfully submitted that the present application is in condition for final allowance and notice to such effect is requested. If the Examiner believes that additional issues need to be resolved before this application can be passed to issue, the undersigned invites the Examiner to contact her at the telephone number provided below.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: May 2, 2007

By Sylvia Tan  
Sylvia Tan  
Reg. No. 47,324  
GREENBERG TRAURIG LLP  
200 Park Avenue  
New York, NY 10166  
(212) 801-9200